

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/534,916	03/23/2000	David J. Marsh	MS1-525US	9507
22801	7590 08/09/2004		EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC			LEE, SEUNG H	
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201		. 500	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/534,916	MARSH, DAVID J.	
, ·	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Seung H Lee	2876	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 06 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a vinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application application abandonment of this application abandonent which are the state of the contract	ation. A proper reply to a name places the application in	I
PERIOD FOR RE	<u>:PLY</u> [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The see have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of see under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Official inely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extending of the fee. The appropriate extending set in the final Office action	ension n; or
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF</li> </ol>			
<ol><li>The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be</li></ol>	ecause:		
(a) They raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying	the
(d)  they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendme	ent
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place th	ıe
<ol> <li>The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.</li> </ol>	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: None.			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>None</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-22,24-26,38-46,50 and 52-57</u> .		<b>N</b>	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ appl	roved or b)  disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	$\mathcal{N}$	
 10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>		MICHAEL G. LEE PERISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800	\ <b>\</b>

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Owashi et al. (US 6,363,210), Kim et al. (US 5,799,081), Handelman et al. (US 5,666,412), Adams (US 6,378,130), Thompson et al. (US 5,805,204), Teicher (US 5,744,787), and Rouyrre et al. (US 5,841,119) still meet the claimed invention.

Continuation of 10. Other: Claims 1-22,24-26,38-46,50 and 52-57 remain as rejected as set forth in the Final Rejection (see paper NO. 20040402).